DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 156 CE 002 911

TITLE	Operation Breakthrough 1972-1973. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	EDCON Associates, Willow Grove, Pa.
PUB DATE	[73]
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education Programs; *Adult Students; Demonstration Programs; Employer Attitudes; Evaluation Methods; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Spanish Speaking; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Vocational Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Operation Breakthrough

ABSTRACT

Operation Breakthrough, a special demonstration project to upgrade Spanish-speaking workers in entry-level factory jobs, was evaluated by a third-party evaluator at the end of its first year. The teacher training program was found, through interviews with teachers and aides, to be excellent. Curriculum materials were provided by the project, but each of the five sites where the project was carried out developed its own strategies. On-site visits determined that the emphasis in the English as a second language segment was on oral skills. Curriculum changes are planned. The physical facilities at the five sites ranged from poor to excellent, and three of the companies involved provided incentives for student enrollment. Students completing a questionnaire at the end of the school year exhibited a positive reaction to the program. Students who did not complete the program were not surveyed. Teacher responses to a questionnaire were also positive. Interviews with employers demonstrated the importance of their support in the program's outcome. Insufficient data were gathered from standardized tests in one step of the evaluation involving the Ilyin Oral Interview. Specific recommendations for improved use of personnel and equipment and clarification of program emphasis are offered. (AG)

ED101156

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH

1972 - 1973

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by -

EDCON Associates
173 Campmeeting Road
Willow Grove, PA 19090

CG 002911

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Edcon Associates wishes to thank the Operation Breakthrough staff and Mr. James Comerford for their cooperation during the preparation of this report. In addition, the teachers and students who participated were the subject of site visits, interviews, questionnaires and the like. We thank you, one and all, for your indulgence and cooperation. To those site personnel who gave of themselves in this effort, we are most grateful.

We have attempted, herein, to report the results of these interviews, monitoring visits, questionnaires and test instruments. While we recognize that judgment plays a role in any evaluation, errors in reporting or calculation are clearly the responsibility of the authors and not the Operation Breakthrough staff.

CONTENTS PAGE

Acknowledgments	i
Preface	1
Teacher Training Program	4
Curriculum Materials	6
Site Visit Summary Chart	8
Questionnaires	9
Standardized Test Data	14
Demographic Data	20
Summary of Suggestions	22
Afterword	24
Appendix	25

PREFACE

The first year of operation in most, if not all, Federally Funded programs is usually marked by problems of both a procedural and conceptual nature. While Operation Breakthrough, a special demonstration project to upgrade Spanish-speaking workers in entry-level factory jobs, is no exception to this axiom, it has had considerably less trouble in these areas than one might expect. This is significant in light of the nature of the program. Adult basic education, low income clients, and English as a Second Language are all factors that can result in program development and implementation problems.

The extent of start-up activities may have been underestimated at the proposal stage.[1] This resulted in classes not beginning until January, 1973. Some of the problems that were encountered were related to gaining industrial cooperation, obtaining classroom space, scheduling classes, and providing sufficient time for testing and interviewing. As the year progressed, additional areas of concern were the relevance of the selected curriculum, the development of additional curriculum materials, retention of students, recruitment

---

[1]It should be noted that the evaluation effort did not actually begin until April, 1973. Thus many of the prior activities within the program have been inferred from meetings with the Operation Breakthrough staff.

of new students, and changes in company participation.

In January, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes began at six different locations. Each of these classes was staffed by a teacher and an aide, both of whom received training before and at the beginning of the classes' operation. In some instances, company personnel were available, as paid aides, to provide assistance in the technical vocabulary and procedures of the factory. A schedule of classes and the names of the factory participants are included in the Appendix.

The classes associated with the General Electric Company and the John Royle Company were implemented according to the proposed guidelines. At General Electric, students were given three hours per week released time to attend the class which was held three days a week for two hours per day. The class schedule allowed students on both shifts the opportunity to participate. The Royle class was held at the end of one shift without released time. Thus, it was effectively open to only one group of employees. The availability of overtime caused problems with attendance at this site. The third site at which there was a well-established program was supported by The Kelling Nut Company. Although the class was located off-site, the support and interest of company personnel resulted in regularlity of attendance.

Classes sponsored by Ducane Heating Corporation and Wellington Synthetic Fibers, Incorporated were poorly attended because of changes in company support policies. Distance from the job site was also a factor that affected attendance in these two cases.

The Electronics class, established on the basis of interests in electronics and/or participation in a course on electronics, was located in the students' neighborhood. This location seemed to provide a good alternative to the on-site concept.

In general, the conduct of the classes was found to be excellent. In over twenty-five classroom observations, teachers were found to be enthusiastic, pleasant, concerned, aware, and perceptive. They utilized a variety of pedagogical techniques which were judged to be appropriate to the teaching of ESL. Although the emphasis of the program was on oral language, reading and writing were also taught. Attention was paid to conversation, real-life situations, and the use of English on the job. Two problems that were constantly being dealt with were the different ability levels within a class and the frequent changes in attendance patterns. The latter was particularly important because of its effect upon the continuity of the classroom program.

TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

A ten session training program designed "to train the instructional personnel of Operation Breakthrough to teach vocationally oriented English language communication skills to Spanish-speaking industrial workers" was proposed and executed between December, 1972 and April, 1973.

The training personnel were Dr. John Fanselow of Columbia University, Ms. Jean Bodman of Kingsboro Community College, and Mr. Michael Lanzano, Supervisor of the ESL component of RCA/MCDA Training Center #8, New York City.

The instructional skills and behavioral objectives proposed for the training sessions were approached through a variety of techniques including demonstration lessons, lectures, peer teaching, and discussion. The final session (Number 10) consisted of a classroom observation and observation checklist of each teacher and aide. The training personnel also completed an evaluation form dealing with the organization of the program and its objectives. A copy of each of these instruments is included in the Appendix.

The project staff has prepared a very thorough report on the teacher training program, on which the contractor need not expand. In addition, the second quarterly progress report for Operation Breakthrough contains copies

of the basic proposal objectives, schedules, and observation checklist.

It may be noted here that the program monitors solicited teachers' and aides' opinions of the training program in conjunction with their site visits. All of those interviewed believed that the training sessions challenged their ideas about teaching and students, were demanding, and in general, they reported them as excellent.

CURRICULUM MATERIALS

The original intent of Operation Breakthrough was to use Book 1 of the Prevocational English series as the primary text. The completion of the 20 lesson Book 1 was the basic instruction goal for the project. As it worked out, the text was unsuitable for the classes and the teachers at each site supplemented this text to a considerable degree with their own materials. It should be noted that the project staff did adapt some of the Book 1 lessons to the needs of the companies. Nevertheless, as indicated in their earlier reports, in the second year of operation a change in curriculum materials will be made.

Monitoring of classes showed that the class work was primarily oral, an intent of the project, although written work and textbooks other than Book 1 have been used, to some degree. For example, at The Kelling Nut Company, English Sounds and their Spellings, Crowell Contemporary English Series has been consulted. In addition, the Wellington class has made use of Graded Exercises in English and the Royle class, Constructing Dialogue by Earl Rand.

Individual locations have attempted to make the curriculum more plant-oriented. For example, at John Royle, the teacher was taught the names of tools and machines in the plant. The teacher then taught the

English names to the student and easier communication has been reported by the plant Manager.

While it is clear that the project did attempt to provide materials to the classes, it is equally clear that each site developed strategies on their own. Since a change is planned in curriculum materials for next year and because of the individualized materials used, further evaluation of the Prevocational English series is not required.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF SITE VISITS

SITE	NUMBER OF MONITORING VISITS	AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PHYSICAL FACILITY	AVERAGE NUMBER OF AIDES	COMPANY INCENTIVES	INITIAL ENROLLMENT	MIDTERM ENROLLMENT
General Electric	4	9	Excellent	1	3 hours released time. Possible upgrading	14	11
Ducane Heating	5	5	Fair	1		20	6
Kelling Nut	6	8	Good	2	Bonus	23	17
Wellington Synthetic Fibers	5	2	Poor	0		17	4
John Royle	5	5	Good	2	Upgrading	13	7
Electronics Class	3	8	Good	1		16	10
Totals	28	37		1		103	55

QUESTIONNAIRES

Student Questionnaire. At the end of the school year a 13 item questionnaire was distributed to each of the Operation Breakthrough classes. Students were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and were given the option of answering either in Spanish or English. The questionnaire was written in Spanish. The sixteen returned questionnaires represent approximately a forty percent sample of the average number of students in attendance.

The questionnaire items and responses may be found in Table 2. The overwhelmingly positive nature of the students' attitudes and perceptions is a reflection of the success of the program for these individuals. Only one of the comments made on the questionnaire was negative.

It is interesting to note that the students felt that the time and location of the classes were convenient. This information may not be representative of all of the possible clients for Operation Breakthrough classes since many students dropped out of the program because of the time or location. When company time was available for instruction and when the class was on site or nearby, these factors were less important.

TABLE 2

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AND RESPONSES

1. Does the program seem to be based on your present needs and skills? very much (11), some (3), very little (0)
2. How much time does your employer give you for study and classes each week? According to company, from zero to six hours.
3. Have you had any difficulties with this program? yes (0), no (14)
4. How did you find out about this program? at work (9), from t.v. (3), from a friend (4)
5. Is the location of the class convenient for you? yes (11), no (2)
6. Is the class at a good time for you? yes (16), no (0)
7. Did you have materials to take home? yes (11), no (4)
8. Do you have time at home to use such materials? yes (13), no (0)
9. Do you think you will continue with any educational program in the future? yes (14), no (0)
10. How long do you plan to remain in the United States? less than one year (0), 1-2 years (1), 2-3 years (0), more than 3 years (15)

11. Do you feel more confident of your abilities in English? yes (13), no (1)

12. Do you feel this class has helped you improve

a) pronunciation much (8), some (2), little (0)

b) vocabulary much (9), some (2), little (1)

c) writing skills much (9), some (2), little (1)

d) conversation skills much (9), some (3), little (1)

The last question on the student questionnaire asked for any additional comments the students would care to make. The following is a representative sample of the written comments:

"The program has given me a lot of opportunities for learning English and a lot of grammar."

"What the teachers teach is excellent."

"I'm happy with this program because I learned some English."

"I like it."

"I wish I could learn more. My most difficulty is understanding other people and the way they talk and pronunciation in English."

"I wish the program would continue. Continue from two to three until we definitely learn English completely. Thank you."

"I wish I could take the classes everyday."

"This is a marvelous program and I can tell you that I'm grateful because of the English I learned. Please continue the program."

"This course has been very well prepared and I hope it doesn't stop there. We need a lot of materials to continue with language. Thank you for everything."

Teacher Questionnaires. Four of the six teachers responded to a questionnaire which was designed to determine their perceptions of the students, the company sponsors and the Operation Breakthrough program. They characterized the students as interested, responsive to the program, and making progress. Progress was generally slow, but steady; although the rate of turnover has had a negative effect.

Administrative support was consistently rated as excellent. Some of the suggestions made were that more discussions take place with students to determine their goals, that more interaction among the various teachers take place, and that the counselor visit with the students more frequently.

The use of technical aides (company employees who work with the teachers) led to the incorporation of factory vocabulary in the classes. The effectiveness of this emphasis was reported periodically by plant supervisors and foremen. Some employment situations required little or no English language communication skills. In these instances the class work was primarily focused upon practical, daily communication situations.

In general, the materials provided by Operation Breakthrough were used as the basis of instruction. Materials and equipment from the work-site and pictures, newspapers, or role-play situations of daily life were additional resources that teachers' lessons were focused upon.

Employer Reports. Structured interviews were conducted with employers of the three companies that supported and participated in the program as it had been planned (Kelling, Royle, G. E.). At each site a high level administrator was responsible for the class. Their involvement included classroom observations, interviews with students, visitations to students on the job, and meetings with the teachers. Students who completed the program in these locations were practically guaranteed an upgrading in salary and/or position. The plant manager at one site rewarded the nine students who graduated with a three hundred dollar bonus. (Note - this bonus is not included in the salary data reported below.) In general, the enthusiasm of the company representatives and their willingness to cooperate and communicate with the program personnel resulted in quite successful program implementation.

STANDARDIZED TEST DATA

In this section of the report, data from the tests administered are summarized. All the statistics reported are of a descriptive nature and no inferential techniques have been applied. Because of gaps in the data, the proposed regression analyses were not possible. The reader is reminded that these data are only descriptive of a small group of participants and may or may not be indicative of the data one might obtain from a larger group.

ILYIN ORAL INTERVIEW - EXPERIMENTAL EDITION

The Ilyin requires the examinee to do no reading or writing. Rather, through a series of 50 questions, the student's ability to use English orally in response to spoken English is studied. One of the two alternate forms of the Interview (BILL Form, SAM Form) is administered in an interview format where the administrator transcribes each verbal response exactly as given. These responses are scored for information, word order, verb structures, and other (use of prepositions, articles, pronouns, and so on). Four points are possible for each item with a perfect score of 200.

TABLE 3

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND SAMPLE SIZES (N) OF THE PRETEST ILYIN SCORES FOR ALL SITES

	KELLING	G.E.	DUCANE	ROYLE	WELLINGTON	ELECTRONICS	ALL PROJECT CLASSES	CONTROL
Mean	30.9	79.2	124.0	24.3	61.3	83.4	59.9	-
S.D.	47.4	48.4	52.3	23.3	66.5	57.2	55.7	-
N	15	9	2	3	4	10	43	-

TABLE 4

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND SAMPLE SIZES (N) OF THE POSTTEST ILYIN SCORES FOR ALL SITES

	KELLING	G.E.	DUCANE	ROYLE	WELLINGTON	ELECTRONICS	ALL PROJECT CLASSES	CONTROL
Mean	62.3	104.9	77.3	119.0	148.0	92.5	89.9	-
S.D.	59.3	66.0	81.4	93.3	0.0	59.7	64.0	-
N	8	9	4	2	1	8	32	-

The Ilyin instrument is very well suited to the objectives of the program. The oral component required gives the instrument excellent content validity with a testing format to which examinees can readily relate. However, the instrument itself can take a very long time to administer. This fact may partially explain the small sample sizes for both the pretest and posttest. The reader will note for example, that no data were available for students in the traditional A.B.E. program (control). In light of this, the Operation Breakthrough staff thought that either shortening the Ilyin or scoring for fewer dimensions might allow one to use this excellent instrument to maximum advantage. Because of the small number of examinees for whom data are available, it is not possible, at this time, to indicate, with any empirical certainty, which items could be eliminated. However, two other approaches are possible.

For one - Donna Ilyin, the author of the interview has suggested a shortening (no transcription) scoring procedure, viz.

"Two points if both information and structure are correct, one point if something sounds funny or odd or incorrect but the answer shows some communication, zero (0) if no communication takes place that is relevant to the question or cue."

This scoring procedure can then be studied in terms of characteristics such as reliability and efficiency.

Secondly, it is possible to study the intercorrelations of the five Ilyin scores: Information, Word Order, Verb, Other, and Total. While the correlations between Total score and the remaining four were quite high, the Word Order score correlated the highest. Values of 0.99 and 0.98 were obtained for the pretest and posttest respectively. Tentatively, one could conclude that the Total score on the Ilyin is very highly related to the Word Order score. This finding may bear on the Ilyin time factor. The total matrix for both pretest and posttest is given below in Table 5.

TABLE 5

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG ILYIN SCORES*

	Information	Order	Verb	Other	Total
Information	1.00	.95	.76	.84	.96
Order	.93	1.00	.85	.95	.99
Verb	.84	.92	1.00	.90	.90
Other	.87	.95	.96	1.00	.96
Total	.94	.98	.96	.97	1.00

*The pretest correlations are above the main diagonal, posttest below.

E.S.L. Diagnostic Test. The second instrument designed to be administered on a pretest - posttest was the 50 item multiple-choice E.S.L. Diagnostic Test. The first 37 items deal with knowledge of English grammar, syntax, adjective positions, and so on. Several of the items deal with points of confusion between English and Spanish translation. For example, in item 8;

How old is that lady?

(a) She is 35 years old.

(b) She has 35 years old.

(c) She is 35 years.

(d) She has 35 years.

For each of the remaining 13 items, the stem is a sentence written in Spanish. The examinee is required to "choose the correct way to say it in English." The instrument is scored for number right and scores are not obtained separately for Parts I and II.

As with the Ilyin data, no inferential techniques have been applied. For example, because so few examinees took both the pretest and posttest, it is impossible to determine growth or change over time. As it worked out only 16 students took both administrations of the E.S.L. Diagnostic Test - 10 from the six experimental sites and six from the traditional A.B.E. class. This dearth of data makes any comparisons either across sites or over time ill-advised.

TABLE 6

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND SAMPLE SIZES (N) OF THE PRETEST E.S.L. DIAGNOSTIC TEST SCORES FOR ALL SITES

	KELLING	G.E.	DUCANE	ROYLE	WELLINGTON	ELECTRONICS	ALL PROJECT CLASSES	CONTROL
Mean	15.5	19.7	19.4	13.2	23.8	-	17.9	20.5
S.D.	17.9	7.6	11.9	7.9	16.0	-	11.3	11.6
N	6	11	5	9	4	-	35	28

TABLE 7

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND SAMPLE SIZES (N) OF THE POSTTEST E.S.L. DIAGNOSTIC TEST SCORES FOR ALL SITES

	KELLING	G.E.	DUCANE	ROYLE	WELLINGTON	ELECTRONICS	ALL PROJECT CLASSES	CONTROL
Mean	24.4	28.7	22.0	23.0	-	27.4	25.9	26.0
S.D.	10.0	9.8	7.5	4.2	-	11.4	9.5	7.9
N	8	7	3	2	-	7	27	27

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Data were available for a total of 167 program participants. Fifty were from the traditional A.B.E. program and 117 from the six experimental sites. Sixty-seven percent of the participants were men. For those employees on whom age or education data were available, the average age was approximately 30.2 years with 9.3 years of schooling. Because of the paucity of data, as noted above, it was impossible to determine whether age or sex was related to the test scores obtained. Salary data were given for employees in the six experimental sites. The average increment in salary was $0.41 - from an hourly average of $2.62 to that of $3.03. The average number of hours of instruction for the experimental site employees was 52.8. However, an average of 122 hours was available. This discrepancy between available and actual hours of instruction may explain why there was no relationship between hours of instruction and either the post Ilyin or post E.S.L. Diagnostic scores. This is not to say that instruction was ineffective. In point of fact, there were many indications of very effective instruction. However, there may not have been sufficient instruction for a sustained period. Because many students dropped out of classes for various reasons (personal problems, illness,

and so on), one must keep in mind the short instructional time in the interpretation of these data.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS

1. Aides were not always used productively. This is typical of "aide programs" because of a lack of role definition and a lack of training in aide utilization.

2. Criteria for involvement of companies should be established. Some dimensions that have already been identified as important are company size, classroom space, and potential for job/salary improvement.

3. Attention should be paid to ways of dealing with the variety of ability levels within the classes.

4. Audio-visual equipment might be used profitably (e.g. tape recorders, movie projectors, slide projectors).

5. The use of consumable materials that students could study or review at home is a valuable technique that could be employed more.

6. Staff meetings at which teachers could share materials and ideas should be a regular part of the program.

7. The emphasis on vocational or conversational English should be clarified. The predominance of one or the other may be related to student ability and to the company itself.

8. The Advisory Committee apparently has not met and served no real function. If such a group is to operate, membership should be restricted to persons who can be both helpful to and active in the program.

9. Some staff members have expressed the recommendation that the program be concentrated into a two-month period with daily classes. This could eliminate some of the dropout and attendance problems.

10. What other programs are available to the Operation Breakthrough student population?

AFTERWORD

The report included herein describes an evaluation of Operation Breakthrough for 1972 - 1973. We have attempted to provide data from many different sources, including observations by monitors, structured interviews, and standardized instruments. As with any evaluation effort, the more systematically data are collected and compiled, the stronger the base from which decisions can be made. During the coming year, increased efforts should be made to obtain pretest and posttest data, both demographic and test-oriented. Without these data, many decisions concerning program improvement and information on program effectiveness are not possible.

APPENDIX

CLASS SCHEDULE

1. Ducane Heating Corporation - manufacturer of furnaces and boilers.

   1:00 - 3:00 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays

   1:00 - 2:00 p.m. Thursdays

2. General Electric Company - manufactures components for and assembles gear motors.

   2:30 - 4:30 p.m. Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays

3. The Kelling Nut Company - processor of roasted nuts.

   4:40 - 6:30 p.m. Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays

4. John Royle Co. - manufacturer of extruders.

   4:00 - 6:00 p.m. Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays

5. Wellington Synthetic Fibers, Inc. - manufacturer of webbing used in porch furniture, of plastic screening, and of items such as plastic typewriter covers and plastic furniture covers.

   3:30 - 4:45 p.m. Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays

6. Electronics Class

   6:30 - 8:30 p.m. Mondays, Fridays

   6:30 - 7:45 p.m. Wednesdays

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH

Observation Check List

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

_____, in conducting the lesson on _____
Participant date

met the stated objectives with regard to:

	TYPES OF LANGUAGE PRACTICE	COMMENTS
	Choral repetition	
	Individual repetition	
	Substitution drill	
	Question-answer drills Teacher - student Student - teacher Student - student	
	Transformation drill	
	Dialog	
	Pronunciation drill	
	Drill table	
	Reading: Simplified Adapted Preparation for Read-and-look-up Questions on	
	Writing: Dictation Exercises Controlled composition Job-related forms Follow-up (correction)	
	Vocabulary teaching	
	Free or guided conversation	
	Role-playing	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	TEACHER'S TECHNIQUES	COMMENTS
	Gestures	
	Intonation	
	Stress	
	Rate of speaking	
	Backward build-up	
	Questioning to ascertain comprehension	
	Change of lesson, technique, etc. in response to faulty comprehension or performance	
	Pacing of lesson	
	Use of visual aids, realia, etc.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	SUBJECTIVE JUDGMENTS	COMMENTS
	Presentation of lesson showed attention to students' needs, imagination, and careful thought.	
	Structures were presented clearly, in an organized manner.	
	Lesson clearly had a relevant objective(s).	
	The objective was achieved.	
	Students appeared to enjoy the class.	
	Teacher appeared to enjoy the class.	
	Student-teacher rapport appears good.	
	Material was relevant to the students' interests and needs.	
	Teacher pays attention to the students.	
	Mutual respect between teacher and students is apparent.	

MASTER TEACHER EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name of Master Teacher: _____

I. What did you think of the organization of the program?

(a) The grouping of teachers and aides together--it was supposed to make them into a cohesive team, provide everybody with a similar standard of good teaching, etc. Did it accomplish that, or what did it accomplish? Should they have been grouped by levels of competence? What?

(b) Having the training sessions at a separate location, away from the classes; having a ratio of four observations to nine training sessions--what happened as a result of this? What was good about whatever happened, and what bad? What would you have liked to have happened with the training, that didn't because of this facet of organization?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(c) Large-group presentations, videotapes, small-group discussions, peer-teaching, paid demonstration students, etc.-- Which of these did you find useful? neutral? useless?-- and why?

(d) If you were setting up the training for this group. how would you organize it?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(e) Did "self-consciousness" or sheer fear hold us back from achieving our objectives as easily as possible?

It seems to me that everyone involved in this training explained often and clearly that it was a "working together" sort of deal, that it was important to pay attention to one's students, that the various authority figures were there to help, not destroy--and the majority of the trainees immediately taught every lesson they were observed doing for at least two months as if they were up on a stage, in a vacuum, going through motions the least one of which might bring a guillotine down on their necks. This causes me to think that our actions were not the same as our words. Do you agree?

What, of our actions and our organization, do you think, could have been changed--to avoid hanging everybody up, to facilitate learning, and to open up communication?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. What did you think of our objectives?

(a) If, under ideal conditions, a teacher learned to do brilliantly everything we had on the list to teach--would that make him or her competent to teach our classes? What did you think was especially relevant to what they're doing? irrelevant? What else would you include, if you were setting up your own objectives?

(b) Was there too much emphasis placed on skills and techniques, and not enough on background understandings that a teacher ought to have? i.e., Was there too much emphasis on how to drill a pattern and too little on what a pattern is, and what is involved in structure? Please explain your answer.

What pre-requisite knowledge should a teacher or aide have before starting in a training program such as this, in order to end up effective in their classes?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(c) (For John and Jean)

Why didn't you mention at the beginning that you two weren't into teaching audio-lingual any more yourselves? Is it impossible to train the other way? Did you think we wouldn't be interested? or what?

The reason for asking is that it has turned a lot of my teachers on, and all of a sudden it's no longer a battle to get them to try anything, and they're caring about it, and they're soaking things up. If there is this interest and energy which somehow gets unleashed by the "silent" method--it seems to me that by putting some of that into our objectives, we could have had a program where the trainees' objectives coincided with ours, and very possibly a good thing going. Is there a reason why this is not a valid assumption?

III. How effectively did we meet our objectives?

(a) In individual cases. This is taken care of by your filling in the "Final Evaluation" forms.

(b) With regard to the unstated, underlying, overriding, all-important general objective: turn out a good, creative, intelligent, independent teacher. Train somebody who really teaches. Now, I don't think we've done that. Some people already were fine teachers. For the others, I think we have taught (some) people a set of (some) new skills . . . kind of mechanical skills. And some of the people we have taught are the "born teacher" types, who will take the leap into intelligence and creativity no matter whether they're taught it or not. And the others are simply going through the motions; or don't dare to take any leaps because the risk is too great. I don't think we have taught (allowed?), as effectively as possible, the creativity and intelligence. Agree? or disagree? I think that teaching is a cognitive and creative skill, as well as mechanical, so it must be possible to teach it that way. Agree? or disagree? I am not sure how. Do you have any suggestions?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV. Put whatever else you would like to say, and/or answer the questions I should have asked, but didn't.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE